

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 8, 2006, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. THE ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

On page 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the election/restriction requirement is deemed proper and thus made final since the Applicants have not shown why the claimed product cannot be formed by the method proposed by the Examiner.

However, under 35 U.S.C. § 121, restriction is appropriate if two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. As set forth in MPEP § 802.01, inventions are independent if there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, and inventions are distinct if two or more subjects as disclosed are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed. The Examiner attempts to explain how a method (i.e., claims 1-6) is distinct from a product (i.e., claims 7-18). However, the Examiner fails to explain how the method (i.e., claims 1-6) is independent from the product (i.e., claims 7-18). That is, both the method (i.e., claims 1-6) and the product (i.e., claims 7-18) are